



MINUTES OF THE IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019, 4:00 PM
CITY HALL, ROOM 207**

PLEASE NOTE TIME CHANGE

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, Excused: Chris Wery

Others present: Rick Jensen

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the agenda. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the minutes. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery on future repairs/upgrades to Shawano Avenue from Ashland to Oneida.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold request by Ald. Wery on future repairs/upgrades to Shawano Avenue from Ashland to Oneida. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on request by Ald. Wery that the City take ownership and/or maintenance of the drainage pond serving Hannah Street.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to hold request by Ald. Wery that the City take ownership and/or maintenance of the drainage pond serving Hannah Street. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action by Department of Public Works to enter into a professional service agreement with OMNNI Associates for the design of Gray Street in the amount of \$68,800.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Department of Public Works to enter into a professional service agreement with OMNNI Associates for the design of Gray Street in the amount of \$68,800. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action by Department of Public Works, in conjunction with the Purchasing Department, for prior authorization to award a contract for the purchase of traffic signal poles to the low responsive bidder at a staff level upon receipt of bids.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve request by Department of Public Works, in conjunction with the Purchasing Department, for prior authorization to award a contract for the purchase of traffic signal poles to the low responsive bidder at a staff level upon receipt of bids . Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

5. Consideration with possible action on the review and approval of the 2019 Special Assessment factors and rates.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve the 2019 Special Assessment factors and rates. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on the report of the Purchasing Manager:

A. Request approval to award the purchase of Half Duplex Radios and Lightning Arrestors for the SCADA System for City Lift Stations to TCIC, Inc. for \$73,800.

B. Request approval to contract with Gridsmart Technologies for the purchase of traffic signal control equipment to be used at seven intersections on West Mason Street as part of WisDOT Safety Improvement Project.

To approve the report of the Purchasing Manager:

A. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to award the purchase of Half Duplex Radios and Lightning Arrestors for the SCADA System for City Lift Stations to TCIC, Inc. for \$73,800. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

B. Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to award a sole source contract to Gridsmart Technologies for the purchase of traffic signal control equipment to be used at seven intersections on West Mason Street as part of WisDOT Safety Improvement Project in the amount of \$147,262. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Report the award of contract RAZING BUILDINGS FOR WEBSTER AVE. RECONSTRUCTION - Group #4 to the low, responsive bidder, Best Enterprises, LLC, in the amount of \$26,900.

Moved by Ald. Jesse Brunette, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to receive and place on file the report of award of contract RAZING BUILDINGS FOR WEBSTER AVE. RECONSTRUCTION - Group #4 to the low, responsive bidder, Best Enterprises, LLC, in the amount of \$26,900. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

8. Consideration with possible action on the review and award of the following contracts:

A. ELEVATOR MODERNIZATION GREEN BAY CITY HALL - REBID

B. RAY NITSCHKE MEMORIAL BRIDGE HYDRAULIC REPAIRS - REBID

C. WEST SIDE MUNICIPAL GARAGE TRENCH DRAIN REPLACEMENT

A. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to hold the contract ELEVATOR MODERNIZATION GREEN BAY CITY HALL - REBID. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

B. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to deny the award of contract RAY NITSCHKE MEMORIAL BRIDGE HYDRAULIC REPAIRS - REBID. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

C. Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the award of contract WEST SIDE MUNICIPAL GARAGE TRENCH DRAIN REPLACEMENT to the low, responsive bidder, Martell Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$28,996.50. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

9. Consideration with possible action on applications for Concrete Sidewalk Builders License by Martell Construction, Inc.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the application for Concrete Sidewalk Builders License by Martell Construction, Inc. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

10. Consideration with possible action on applications for Tree & Brush Trimmer Licenses by the following:

- A. Economy Tree Service LLC
- B. Holtger Bros., Inc.
- C. Nelson Tree Service LLC
- D. Yesterday's Trees

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve the applications for Tree & Brush Trimmer Licenses by the following:

- A. Economy Tree Service LLC
- B. Holtger Bros., Inc.
- C. Nelson Tree Service LLC
- D. Yesterday's Trees

Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

- I. Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to receive and place on file the Director's Report on recent activities of the Public Works Department. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

- 2. The next Improvement and Services Committee meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2019.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ald. Jesse Brunette to approve to adjourn the Improvement and Services Committee meeting. Motion carried. Vote: Yes- Andy Nicholson, Brian Johnson, Jesse Brunette, No- None, Abstain- None

VERBATIM MINUTES

- [Andy] Try to catch up with the computer first.
- [Steve] We're rolling.

- **[Andy]** All right. Let's bring the Improvement Services Committee to order. Let it be recorded. Brunette, Johnson, Nicholson are present. Wery is absent, excused. Approval of the agenda.

- **[Brian]** So moved.

- **[Andy]** Motion by Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- **[Andy]** Nays, motion carried. Approval of minutes. Motion by

- Approve.

- **[Andy]** Brunette to approve, seconded by Johnson, Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Nays, motion carried. Okay, regular business, no approval of the minutes.

- **[Jesse]** We just did that.

- Did we, okay?

- Yep, you're good.

- **[Andy]** Okay, regular business, consideration for possible action on request by Alderman Wery on future repairs, upgrades through Chunel Ave., thanks, Steve, from Ashland to Oneida.

- I'll give just a back story and then you guys can decide if you want to discuss it and take action or if you want to hold it until next meeting. Ashland Avenue, or Chunel Avenue between Ashland Avenue and Oneida was resurfaced as a Wisconsin Department of Transportation project in 2005. What they did was they did a thin mill and then put an asphalt overlay about an inch and a half thick over the road to improve ride quality. It was very bumpy at the joints so they did just a surface overlay, a skin patch, on it. That particular portion of Chunel Avenue at that point is State Trunk Highway 29. It's a connecting highway coming through the City of Green Bay, which is why DOT funded it. Over the past four years or so, the asphalt is starting to delaminate from the underlying concrete to the point where we have sections the size of dinner plates that are peeling off and creating potholes, especially in the winter. Two years ago, when it first started getting bad where we needed to do something about it, I did have a conversation with

the Department of Transportation because that is their connecting highway. They do not have this program within the foreseeable future so we have been doing maintenance work out there to try to patch in some of these holes and make it a little bit more rideable but it's only gonna last for so long. Unfortunately, so you folks know, keep this in the back of your mind as you're deliberating things, in 2008 a similar project was completed on Main Street between the Fox River and Baird Street. So that entire length on Main Street, that's ripe to have the same thing happen again. DOT when I had the conversations with them two years ago said this type of project would never be approved in today's climate. They found out it simply didn't work. But they don't have anything programed to fix it. We're looking at a substantial investment because this is not something that we can simply rip off the old asphalt and put a new asphalt overlay. We know it will fail again. The only way to correctly do this would be a full reconstruct of Chunnel Ave.

- [Andy] Okay, have you talked to Alderman Wery at all, Steve, on this?

- No, I have not.

- [Andy] So we don't know what he's looking for.

- I'm pretty sure what he's looking for is something to make it better so we don't have a bunch of potholes.

- [Andy] Okay.

- [Brian] Did you already do that though?

- We're patching it as best we can but what really needs to be done is that it needs to be fully reconstructed and that's gonna carry a substantial price tag to do that. There are other streets that haven't had, it's only been 14 years since this had a maintenance project on it and we've got streets that have been out there for 40 years that haven't even had a maintenance project yet. For this one to get two kicks at the cat before another street gets its first one, there needs to be some discussion about that. So again, I just wanted to give you guys some back story so that when we have a discussion with some possible action on it, you've got it. But understanding Alderman Wery's not here, if you feel more comfortable waiting because it's his item or if you want to discuss now and actions made, I'm fine either way.

- [Jesse] I would, motion to hold.

- [Andy] Motion by Brunette to hold 'til our next meeting, second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried. Two consideration, here's another one by Wery. Consideration of possible action under request by Alderman Wery that the City take ownership and/or maintenance of the drainage pond serving Hannah Street. Director Grenier.**

- **When the Hannah Heights subdivision went in, this one I have had an email correspondence quite a bit with Alderman Wery. When the Hannah Heights subdivision was first built, stormwater management for the subdivision was required and the developer was notified that. The developer elected to use a lower cost, cheaper to implement, but not as reliable on the stormwater management device and that is a dry pond with an infiltration basin. We had recommended that they use a traditional wet pond. They did not want to encumber that much property within the subdivision so they decided to do a series of drainage swales through the backyards connecting to a pond that fills and then de-waters a dry pond that doesn't contain water at all times and then this infiltration phase. So there were drainage easements and stormwater easements recorded on several properties. Another requirement of the subdivision was that a homeowners' association be formed, dues be paid into that, and the dues from that HOA would go towards funding the stormwater management, maintenance, and operation over time. Lots were sold, the stormwater drainage easements in peoples' backyards were filled in to put yards in because they didn't want a drainage swale in the backyard. The easements still retain on the property but it doesn't function as a swale anymore. The property on the northwest corner of Hannah and, I'm trying to remember--**

- **[Jesse] San Jose.**

- **San Jose Place?**

- **[Jesse] I think so.**

- **On the northwest corner is where the dry pond is, the northeast corner is where the infiltration basin is. Those folks are left with these facilities sitting on their properties that don't function very well and the HOA has subsequently dissolved. There's no money to maintain these properties the way that they were intended to. So now the subdivision owners and property owners that have these encumbrances on the property are asking for the City to take ownership possession of the stormwater management devices and maintain them. As we stated previously, the City has no interest in them. We didn't want these to be installed, we suggested that a pond be installed. The way that they are constructed and have been maintained to date, they do not function in a way that would allow us to receive the stormwater credit from the DNR for our MS4 permit, which is the only reason that we have stormwater management devices around the City is for complaints with our MS4 permit and it would be an unnecessary encumbrance on the stormwater utility to take over a pond that was built against our design and provides absolutely no benefit to the City. So I've told Alderman Wery in the past that we're not interested in the pond, we don't want it, but he's bringing it before the committee and the Council for consideration to relieve the homeowners of their obligation and have the stormwater utility take it over instead.**

- **[Andy]** Okay, what are the wishes of the committee?
- **[Jesse]** I'll make a motion to hold until our next regularly scheduled--
- **[Andy]** Motion by Brunette to hold to our next meeting. Second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?
- **Aye.**
- **Aye.**
- **[Andy]** Nays, motion carried. Three, consideration of possible action by the Department of Public Works to enter into a professional services agreement with Omni Associates--
- **Yes.**
- **[Andy]** For the design of Gray Street in the amount of \$68,800. Director Grenier.
- **A couple of years ago we received some DOT funding for both Mathers Street and Gray Street and we went through the DOT solicitation process, selected a design consultant to handle both of those projects, that was Omni Associates. The Mathers Street project was constructed last year. If you remember, it was probably this time last year, about a year or a year and a half ago, somewhere in there. I had to come to you and let you know that with the change in State funding, the Gray Street project was dropped and DOT was no longer gonna participate in that. At that point we suspended all work on design of the Gray Street project. We'd like to bring that project forward and because Omni was selected to do the design, they have all of the relevant information. The difference being, instead of this being an 80/20 cost share between the City and the feds to fund the design, this will be 100 percent city-funded. But we feel it's in the City's best interest to have Omni continue that design, finish that off so we can get the project bid on. And I believe this is scheduled to be, it would be constructed next year, correct?**
- **[Assistant]** '20 or '21.
- **Yeah, so it'll either be a '20 or '21 project.**
- **[Andy]** Okay, any questions or concerns?
- **[Jesse]** Move to approve.
- **[Andy]** Motion to approve by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?
- **[Jesse]** Aye.

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. Four, consideration with possible action by Department of Public Works in conjunction with the Purchasing Department for prior authorization to award a contract for the purchase of traffic signal walls to the lower responsive bidder at a staff level upon receipt of bids. Director Grenier.

- We received a grant, a highway safety grant, through the Traffic Division last year and it's going to be on the West Mason Street corridor, I believe roughly from 12th Avenue--

- To Military.

- To Military. So there's seven intersections along that line that are gonna have traffic signal upgrades and that we're also going to put fiber optic interconnect for a lot of the signals to work together for corridor progression. The way that the grant is structured, we simply contract with the maintenance contractor DOT already has which is Bogart Construction here in Green Bay. They have state-assigned unit prices for a lot of the work. We simply hire Bogart to do the work that was in the plan that was approved. We fund the project up front. It's a 90/10 cost share, the DOT refunds 90 percent of the cost typically within three weeks of us submitting the invoice back to them, so it's a quick turnaround on this. What we are doing is we are going to order the poles that the traffic signals sit on because standardization of what we have, our poles fit on our bases. Our electricians are familiar with them, so on and so forth. Probably twice, maybe three times a year, we come through with report of the purchasing agent for traffic signal poles. So the same process that Rick Jensen and his staff do on a regular basis. Traffic signal poles typically have about a 16-week lead time between ordering them and when we need them. If you're familiar with what corridor on West Mason, we're going past Franklin Middle School and Notre Dame Academy. We want to get the work done before school gets back in session in the summer. Taking a look at the calendar when we need to order the poles and what the schedule would be for construction, we're already crammed in pretty tight. So taking a look at going through the normal process where we would have the request for quotes on the street, get those bids back, then come to committee, get approval from the committee to go to the lower responsive bidder, and then bring that to Council, that time delay is gonna put us up against the wall. So what we're asking for is we're gonna follow the same process we always do as far as going through the Purchasing Department and awarding to the lower responsive bidder. We're just asking if we can cut two to three weeks off of that procurement process by giving us prior authorization to award it at the staff level and report it out at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

- [Andy] Any questions or concerns?

- [Jesse] Move to approve.

- [Andy] Motion to approve by Brunette.

- [Brian] Second.

- [Andy] Second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- [Jesse] Aye.

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. Okay, five, consideration with possible action on the review and approval of 2019 Special Assessment Factors and Rates. Director, what do you got?

- [Steve] We have provided for you in your packet a copy of the proposed assessment rates for 2019. Included with that, for comparison purposes, are the rates for 2018. A couple of things worthy of note, the sanitary sewer, we're looking at holding the main line rate at \$65 per front foot, sewer with rock excavation at \$95 per front foot. A four-inch sanitary connection, so that's the lateral going from the main line to the house, we're looking at the raising that from \$1,425 each to \$1,475 each. A four-inch with rock excavation would go up from \$2,425 to \$2,475. A six-inch connection would be increased from \$1,600 each to \$1,700 each. A six-inch with rock excavation would go up from \$2,600 to \$2,700. Storm sewer main line is going to stay at \$65 per front foot. A six-inch storm connections are proposed to go up from \$950 to \$970 each. Twelve-inch storm connections are proposed to go up from \$1,675 each to \$1,720 each. And a stormwater management fee in lieu of, so that would be if somebody is putting in a facility and rather than put in their own stormwater management, they buy into a city-owned regional facility, they offset part of that cost by purchasing credits from us, that would go up from \$2,700 per equivalent runoff unit to \$2,800. Water rates, these come directly from the water utility not drive the in-house. Residential water main is proposed to go up from \$65 to \$75 per front foot. Water main with rock excavation goes up from \$95 to \$105 per front foot. Anybody requiring larger than an eight-inch main goes from \$75 to \$85 per front foot and if it involves rock excavation, it goes up from \$105 to \$115 a front foot. A one-inch water lateral or water surface on a new water main holds at \$1,700 each while one with rock excavation stays at \$2,700. A one-inch lateral on an existing main holds at \$3,700 each. One-inch lateral on an existing main with rock excavation stays at \$4,700 each. For new one-inch services or larger, the water utility passes that cost. It's an actual cost from a contractor that gets passed directly onto the resident. With all of our assessment rates, they're all based in actual construction numbers and with the sanitary and storm we're starting to see an uptick in new residential construction and some new commercial construction in areas that were not previously developed. So our numbers are getting a little truer to actual cost at this point in time. We do back check those using, I think our old numbers were based on about 2005, 2006 and we applied the Engineering News Record construction cost index to them as a back check. Then we get into street construction. One of the things the primary function of what the vehicle registration fee or Wheel Tax was intended to do was to eliminate residential special assessments and to offset by 50 percent other than residential assessments. With that in mind, we still go through and compute what the assessment factor would be and what the equivalent assessment rates in each of the individual categories for payment construction would be, then when we run the assessment rolls on an individual project or the assessable footage of property on the project, it's applied times this rate. But rather than sending individual assessments out against property owners, that dictates how much of the Wheel Tax money is transferred out of the Wheel Tax Fund into the construction fund to fund individual construction projects. So the assessment factors are still very important numbers for us to understand and approve. So we have gone back and taken a look. Again, the

individual types of street and the assessment rates that you see for Type A, Type B, and Type C streets, all of those are a function of the assessment factor you see at the top of the page. So right under where it says, proposed 2019 rate, asphalt pavement \$150 and concrete payment \$230, those are the two numbers that govern because the assessment ordinance actually tells us that for each of the other types of construction it's a percentage thereof. So if you look on the top of the table right here, those assessment factors are what we're really talking about. Again the ordinance tells us that a certain percentage and that's all we do. We take those numbers, multiply it times a percentage and we fill the table then. So everything on this sheet--

- [Andy] Is that on here?

- It should be in the attachment.

- [Andy] How do I get to the attachment?

- Keep scrolling.

- [Andy] Oh, it's coming, okay.

- So again, we're looking at going up on the assessment factor. Asphalt pavement we're proposing to go from \$125 a foot to \$150 a foot and concrete we're looking at going from \$205 to \$230 and again, a percentage of that gets applied from the actual assessment number. With that asphalt reconstruction, we reconstructed two asphalt streets in 2018, Smith Street and St. George. They were shorter streets, had different clear widths than what the standard street assumed for assessment purposes is so we took the construction costs, did some proration based on length and width. Asphalt, pavement and with those prorations, that's how we came up with \$150. Historically, going back to 2011, in 2011, '12, and '13 the assessment factor was at \$110. In '14, '15, and '16 it was at \$115. In '17 we went up to \$125, this year we're proposing to go to \$150. That is directly in line with actual construction costs from what we're seeing on projects. Matter of fact, we're kind of hugging to the bottom of the curve on that. I think we were looking closer to \$170 as an actual cost but we felt it was necessary to kind of moderate that. We didn't want to make such a big jump in one year. Again, this is primarily going to be assessed back to the Wheel Tax money so it's not going to have as direct an impact on property owners as it would have in another year. But it doesn't matter who's paying for it, it's still coming from somewhere. We want to help moderate that a little bit. Concrete construction, we had one new street, Eerie Road, off the I-43 industrial park. That was about an 805 foot section. As we talked about on the asphalt streets, going back to 2011, 2011 through 2015 the assessment factor was held steady at \$200 a front foot. In '16 and '17 that had gone up to \$205 per front foot. We are proposing to go up to \$230 per front foot this year. We have seen construction prices in the last 14 to 16 months increase by over 27 percent. So just taking that same logic, if you take 27 percent you're at \$200. We should actually be up around 250 bucks but we feel confident at \$230 per concrete street to be our assessment factor for this year. Going onto the last page of the table, we were gonna look at asphalt resurfacing. Just as a reminder, the asphalt resurfacing, the intent there is that we should be recovering through assessments about 60 percent of the cost of the asphalt materials only. 40

percent's on the construction project and 60 percent was assessed back out. So we take a look at what asphalt prices from last year were and last year was a very expensive year. Asphalt prices went very high last year. Going back to 2011, our assessment factor in 2011 was \$27. We held that in '11 and '12. We went up to \$28.40 in 2013 and we have held that rate ever since. So even with the escalation in asphalt prices, we were able to keep our assessment factor for asphalt resurfacing down where it was affordable. Again, as asphalt prices have increased and we're seeing a measurable uptick again this year, staff is recommending taking the asphalt assessment factor up to \$32 a front foot. That's the large scale view on assessment factors. If you have individual questions, we'd be happy to answer those.

- [Andy] Any questions? Alderman Johnson.

- [Brian] Steve, when I'm looking at the street construction, correct me if I'm wrong, but these would be the only rates within this full proposal that would apply to the special assessments and then subsequently the Wheel Tax?

- These would be the only ones that would apply to the Wheel Tax. Any new subdivision where sewer had not been installed before, the sanitary, sewer, storm, and water main rates would apply there as well.

- [Brian] Because they'll still get assessed to the homeowner?

- Correct.

- [Brian] Okay. So when was the last time that we adjusted these rates? Do we do this annually?

- We bring through the assessment rates on an annual basis but as I was recapping with payment. There had been some upticks since 2011 but by in large we've held pretty steady.

- [Brian] And I'll just maybe just share this as a comment and let you respond. The one thing that I'm looking at is if it's been that long since we've adjusted this, when we looked at the Wheel Tax, I think we were estimating roughly \$750,000 was special assessments that

- Correct. we were going to now forgo.

- [Brian] I'm just curious, how much now with this new increase, how much is that going to impact the balance of that Wheel Tax Fund, if that would thus limit the number of new projects that we could do with it? Does that make sense?

- It makes sense. When we drafted the Wheel Tax memo, we looked at six or seven years worth of construction and gauged a number. That number could be as low as \$350,000 in one year and \$900,000 in another. I just kind of found a happy medium and put the 700 in there assuming that that was a quote, unquote, normal year. Now factors as various as if there was a City park on the street, that wound up not being collected. It

was an assessable property but we were essentially assessing ourselves. So you don't sent a check and you don't receive the money. It's just a City cost. So that would change how much money we're getting in assessments. For instance, on Eastman Avenue, there's a pretty substantial frontage of a park up there on Eastman just east of Baird Street. We can't recover that money. If we were to do a project, when we did Military Avenue there was a part of Murphy Park that was fronting on Military Avenue that's not assessable. So those kind of things lowered how much money we were actually receiving in assessments in those particular years.

- [Brian] Okay, so do you anticipate some of these numbers that you had indicated that you didn't want to see too big of a jump in one year, do you anticipate coming back in a year from now to reevaluate those numbers?

- Well we will come back every year. Every year we're gonna keep coming back with assessment rates and where we feel things are at the end of the year because other than residential properties, commercial/industrial properties, they're still being assessed albeit at a half rate. So if we were to approve this tonight and we reconstruct a tight C street that has other than residential property on it and it's asphalt, that would be \$97.50 as the assessment factor for that street. We would cut that in half. Half of that would be funded out of the Wheel Tax money and half is still going to go as a special assessment against the property. So again, we want to make sure that we are not bumping these rates up just for the sake of grabbing Wheel Tax money and putting it to use. We want to be cognizant of--

- [Brian] And that's what I want to be sure of.

- No, the intent was definitely not to raid the Wheel Tax money to the extent that we can. We approach this no differently than if assessments were still going to be levied against individual property owners.

- [Brian] Okay, one final question, you had mentioned that you would plan to come back next year to look at these assessments but looking backwards, the last time we looked at them was 2011.

- No, no, no, no, no. These come through every year. They're voted on every year.

- [Brian] Okay, so what was the 2011 that you referred to?

- The 2011, I just brought us back in time to 2011 to show what the rate was at that time and how little the rates have actually increased since then.

- [Brian] Okay, understood. Thank you.

- [Andy] Any other questions or concerns? If not, entertain a motion.

- [Jesse] Motion to approve.

- **[Andy]** Motion to approve by Brunette. Same by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- **Aye.**

- **Aye.**

- **[Andy]** Nays, motion carried. Six, consideration of possible action and report of the Purchasing Manager.

- **This uh--**

- **[Andy]** Do you want me to read it first, Rick?

- **No, go ahead, I'm sorry.**

- **[Andy]** No, that's fine. Request approval to award the purchase of half duplex radials of lightning arrestors for the Scata system for the city lift stations to TCIC Incorporated for \$73,800. Rick?

- **This technology is a little bit over my head but I consulted with Nat Hickenheibol and last year we approved a single source request for TCIC. The equipment that we had been using in our lift station, the scating equipment is from this company and it's all compatible and interchangeable. So Nat requested a single source request, the Director approved it and I had approved it last year. So this is a follow up to last year's request. I think last year when we did a couple of lift stations and this year I think we're purchasing about 30 of these radials. My understanding is the radials communicate with our servers and databases to keep information constantly flowing on the operation of the lift stations.**

- **[Andy]** Okay, questions or concerns? If not, I entertain a motion.

- **[Brian]** Motion to approve.

- **[Andy]** Motion to approve by Johnson.

- **Second.**

- **Second by Brunette.**

- **[Andy]** Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- **[Brian]** Aye.

- **[Andy]** Nays, motion carried. B, request approval to contract with Gridsmart Technologies for purchase of a signal light controlling equipment to be used at seven intersections on West Mesa Street as part of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation Safety Improvement Project.

- Again, this project is the one that Steve alluded to earlier. Working with traffic engineer Anderson or Hansen rather, we previously purchased this technology from Gridsmart. It's the best technology in the industry and again, this will keep all of our front signal interchanges on the same system and interoperable.

- [Andy] All right, questions or concerns?

- [Steve] The big thing we're looking for here, we want to make sure that we're very upfront with the costs. We are looking for a sole source procurement for these Gridsmart cameras. The Gridsmart, unlike, if you're familiar with our traffic signal colors, at a lot of the intersections that we have under actuation it's a four-camera system. So there's a camera pointing in each of the ordinal directions down the approaches and it's mounted on an arm that comes out over the intersection. If you look at the four intersections here on Walnut Street, there's a single fisheye panoramic that operates all four. That's the Gridsmart system. Gridsmart really is the only manufacturer that has the detection software in the fisheye type lens that can also do traffic counting and there's a variety of other applications we use. It's one camera instead of four that does a lot of different functions. Because there really only is one supplier out there, it's not something that we can competitively bid. And it does help us with the traffic engineer is actually able to go in there and he can tweak from his desk rather than going out and standing by the cabinet and trial and error kind of thing. We can implement changes and observe how it functions under real traffic conditions. So we're very much sold on the Gridsmart. They are competitive in price, the four-camera setups. So we are requesting a single source or a sole source with the Gridsmarts. And again, this is also part of that West Mason Street corridor. We're making the initial upfront purchase. It becomes a 90/10 cost share. 90 percent state money coming back through DOT.

- [Andy] Okay, any questions or concerns? If not, do we obtain a motion.

- [Jesse] I do approve.

- [Andy] Motion to approve by Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye

- Aye

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. I believe we're at seven, report the award of contract razing buildings for Webster Avenue reconstruction group number four to the lower responsive business, Best Enterprise is LOC in the amount of \$26,900.

- Last fall the committee also granted staff the ability to award contracts relative to the North Webster project, especially for the asbestos abatement and razing of houses. This contract for was the blast of four homes out there. Best Enterprises surprised us. The previous had gone to Badgerly and Begel and Best Enterprises came in with a really

good price and actually undercut Begel and so for the four homes left on that contract, \$26,900 was a steal. So we're simply reporting out it was a competitively bid project run through the Clerk's Office, like every other one, and they were the lowest responsive responsible bidder.

- [Andy] It's just a report to be placed on file?

- That could be placed on file if you would

- All right.

- So moved.

- [Andy] Brunette, second by Johnson. Under discussion? All in favor?

- [Jesse] Aye.

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. Eight, consideration of possible action on the review and award of the following contracts. A, elevator modernization screen-based City Hall marine bed. Do you want to take them all together?

- No, I think we'll go because we'll go on separate actions, each one.

- [Andy] Which one do you want to address?

- Elevator modernization came in, Parks Department oversees City Hall and that's the two elevators over here at City Hall. We don't have all of the funding in place so Dan's gonna be discussing that separately. We are gonna request a hold on the award of that contract. We do have plenty of time. We've got 60 days from bid opening in which to make the award so we're gonna request that we hold that one for further discussion.

- Okay.

- Move to hold.

- [Andy] Motion by Johnson to hold, second by Brunette.

- Second.

- [Andy] Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. B, Ray Niechtke Memorial Bridge hydraulic repair rebid. Director Grenier.

- That one I just handed out a summary. We've bid this late last fall and we received no bids. Word we got from the contractors was that the time schedule for both responding to the bid and the time schedule for the work we had listed was awful tight and folks didn't feel comfortable with it. So we met with the contractors, had another on site pre-bid meeting, walked through some things, re-scoped and re-bid the project. We received bids on Tuesday, yesterday. Only received one bid, it came in at almost \$2.95 million. We had this estimated at less than \$400,000. Reviewing the bid, the contractor threw everything but the kitchen sink in there. It was one of the most outrageous bids I've ever seen in 28 years of professional practice so we are recommending not to award this contract.

- [Andy] Questions or concerns?

- [Brian] Move to deny.

- Motion to deny, Johnson.

- Second.

- [Andy] Second by Brunette. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- [Andy] Nays, motion carried. C, west side municipal garage trench drain replacement. Director Grenier.

- That one, I apologize, we do not have the summary for that. In the report--

- [Andy] Should we take care of it at Council?

- No.

- [Jesse] I have it.

- Okay, then it's just not me. It wasn't in here.

- [Brian] You just talking about the listing of bids?

- Okay, yeah. So Martel Construction was the low responsive responsive bidder. Contract award would be in the amount of \$28,996.50 and staff does recommend award to Martel.

- [Andy] Questions or concerns?

- [Brian] Move to approve.

- **[Andy] Motion to approve by Johnson.**
- **Second.**
- **Second by Brunette.**
- **[Andy] Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?**
- **Aye.**
- **Aye.**
- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried. Nine, consideration with possible action on applications for concrete sidewalk builder's license by Martel Construction, Incorporated. Director Grenier.**
- **They have held a concrete sidewalk builder's license with us for many, many years. We're more than happy to recommend approval.**
- **Motion to approve by--**
- **So moved.**
- **[Andy] Johnson and second by Brunette. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?**
- **Aye.**
- **Aye.**
- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried.**
- **Ten, consideration with possible actions and applications for tree and brush trimmer license by the following. You've got any problem with any of them, Steve?**
- **Nope, all of them are good. They've held licenses with us in the past and we're very satisfied with the work.**
- **A, Economy Tree Service; B, Holger Brothers; C, Nelson Tree Service; and D, Yesterday's Trees. Entertain a motion to approve.**
- **[Brian] So moved.**
- **[Andy] By Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?**
- **[Brian] Aye.**
- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried. Informational, Directors Report, Director Grenier.**

- We actually had a pretty good winter going along up until about the last three weeks. Sewer section has been knocking it out of the park getting a headstart on kelvizing and routine sewer cleaning. Before this week, coming into this week we had six full plow operations and nine spreading operations up to the fourth. We have been plowing or spreading about every other day since then so we've been relying pretty heavily on all the divisions to help fill in. We've got folks from the Sewer Section, we've got folks from Sanitation who've been jumping in on plow vehicles. The Fleet Division has been doing a fantastic job. With that much punishment on the equipment we're starting to experience some breakdowns just due to mechanical failures and as soon as we roll them into the shop, the mechanics are getting them prepped, fixed, and back out on the street as quickly as possible. Engineering Division has been busy. We had a little bit of a downtime there for awhile. We had one employee out on maternity leave. She came back and as soon as she came back we lost one to a medical condition. So we've got him back now. We did have a staff member leave in the fall in our Special Projects Division but I'm happy to report that as of Monday morning, we have an individual coming to fill that vacant engineering position. And for me it's a really happy time because, I don't even know how to pronounce Kala's last name.

- [Assistant] W.

- Kala W., it's Wesolowski or Wesolewski. Hopefully she'll correct me on Monday when she starts. But Kala served as an intern with us for five years while she was going to college and back then she was Kala Sculley so it was a very easy name to remember. But that's the first one of my interns that's coming back and taken a full-time job with us. We're very excited to have her come back and join us. Tonight, as this meeting is going on, we do have Public Information Meetings going on on the third floor for the first couple of construction projects. Again, as we talked about during the discussion on assessment factors, we still do have some properties that will be assessed even though we've got the Wheel Tax. So we will have a couple of assessment hearings and the assessment hearings will probably start with our next meeting in two weeks. And in two weeks we do hope to also bring forward, I know Dan and I talked, he's ready with his capital improvement program. We are not, we are planning on bringing our CIP to you at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

- [Andy] Okay, questions or concerns?

- [Brian] Motion to receive and place on file.

- [Andy] Motion to receive and place on file. Second by Brunette.

- Second.

- [Andy] Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?

- Aye

- Aye

- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried. Motion to adjourn.**
- **So moved.**
- **Second.**
- **[Andy] By Johnson, second by Brunette. Under discussion? Hearing none, all in favor?**
- **Aye.**
- **Aye.**
- **[Andy] Nays, motion carried, we're done.**